REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7, 14-15, and 19 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-4, 7, 14-15 and 19, at page 6, paragraphs 2-3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,931,249 ("Fors") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0218575 ("Ibe"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

None of the cited references, including Fors and Ibe, disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. For example, Fors does not disclose or suggest "sending a call forwarding message including the Internet Protocol (IP) address from the mobile phone to a remote cellular network element of a wide area cellular network via the WWAN module, the call forwarding message to redirect a call destined for the mobile phone to the wireless local area network base station for transmission to the mobile phone," as recited in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Fors discloses that, after the mobile device determines that a handoff from a cellular base station to a wireless access point is preferred, the process of the mobile device sends a "handin request (302) to a cellular access gateway via the wireless local area network access point and the IP network." *See Fors*, col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 12. Fors also discloses that the handin request is sent using an IP packet addressed to the cellular access gateway. *See Fors*, col. 6, lines 11-12. Thus, Fors does not disclose or suggest sending a call forwarding message via a WWAN module, as recited in claim 1.

The Office acknowledges that Fors does not disclose or suggest "sending a call forwarding message including the internet protocol address from the mobile phone to a remote cellular element of a wide area cellular network," as recited in claim 1. Instead, the Office asserts that Ibe discloses this feature. However, Ibe discloses a cellular controller that is part of a corporate local area network (LAN), where the cellular controller creates a proxy for the user's mobile device within the cellular carrier's network to authenticate the user to the network and to send and receive calls. *See Ibe*, p. 3, paragraph [0038]. Ibe fails to overcome the deficiency of Fors, because Ibe does not disclose or suggest "sending a call forwarding message including the Internet Protocol (IP) address from the mobile phone to a remote cellular network element of a wide area cellular network via the WWAN module," as recited in claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the asserted combination of Fors and Ibe fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the claims 2-7. Accordingly, claims 2-7 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

None of the cited references, including Fors or Ibe, disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 14. For example, Fors does not disclose or suggest "wherein the wide area cellular communication module communicates the call forwarding message to the remote wide area cellular network via the cellular interface," as recited in claim 14. Instead, Fors discloses that a mobile device sends a "handin request (302) to a cellular access gateway via the wireless local area network access point and the IP network." *See Fors*, col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 12. Thus, Fors transmits the call forwarding request via the local area network access point and an IP network, and not via the cellular interface. Ibe fails to overcome the deficiency of Fors. In particular, Ibe discloses a cellular controller that is part of a corporate local area network (LAN), where the cellular controller creates a proxy for the user's mobile device within the cellular carrier's network to authenticate the user to the network and to send and receive calls. *See Ibe*, p. 3, paragraph [0038]. The asserted combination of Fors and Ibe fails to disclose or suggest "wherein the wide area cellular communication module communicates the call forwarding message to the remote wide area cellular network via the cellular interface," as recited in claim 14. Hence, claim 14 is allowable.

Claims 15, 18, 19, 22 and 23 depend from claim 14, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the asserted combination of Fors and Ibe fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the claims 15, 18, 19, 22 and 23. Accordingly, claims 15, 18, 19, 22 and 23 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 14.

Claims 5, 6, and 18 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 5, 6 and 18, at page 11, paragraph 4 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fors and Ibe, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0217180 ("Chandra"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from allowable claim 1. As previously discussed, the asserted combination of Fors and Ibe fails to disclose or suggest "sending a call forwarding message

including the Internet Protocol (IP) address from the mobile phone to a remote cellular network element of a wide area cellular network via the WWAN module," as recited in claim 1. Chandra fails to overcome the deficiencies of Fors and Ibe. In particular, Chandra discloses a mobile IP device that can roam between various sub-networks while maintaining Internet connectivity. *See Chandra*, Abstract, p. 2, paragraph [0024]. Chandra discloses a home agent that is adapted to authenticate a roaming mobile node. *See Chandra*, p. 2, paragraph [0024]. Chandra does not disclose or suggest sending a call forwarding message to a cellular network. More particularly, Chandra fails to disclose or suggest "sending a call forwarding message including the Internet Protocol (IP) address from the mobile phone to a remote cellular network element of a wide area cellular network via the WWAN module," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Fors, Ibe and Chandra fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of independent claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable. Additionally, claims 5 and 6 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 18 depends from allowable claim 14. As previously discussed, the asserted combination of Fors and Ibe fails to disclose or suggest "wherein the wide area cellular communication module communicates the call forwarding message to the remote wide area cellular network via the cellular interface," as recited in claim 14. Chandra fails to overcome the deficiencies of Fors and Ibe. Chandra fails to disclose or suggest a wide area cellular communication module that communicates a call forwarding message. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Fors, Ibe and Chandra fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of independent claim 14 and of claim 18, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 14.

New Claims 22-28 are Allowable

With this response, new claims 22-28 are added. Claims 22 and 23 depend from allowable claim 14. Claim 24 is an independent method claim. The cited references, including Fors, Ibe and Chandra, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "sending a call forwarding message from the mobile communication device to a cellular network element of the wide area wireless network via the wide area network communications module," as recited in claim 24. Hence claim 24 is allowable. Claims 25-28 depend from claim 24, and are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 24.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

11-20-2007
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)